

Theology vol 23.

A

DIALOGUE

IN

VINDICATION

Of Our Present

LITURGY and SERVICE :

BETWEEN

TIMOTHY a Churchman, *k*

AND

THOMAS an Essentialist.



L O N D O N :

Printed for J. BETTENHAM and T. BICKERTON at
the Crown in Pater-noster-Row, 1719.

Price 3d.

DIALOGUE

WINDLICATION





A
DIALOGUE
BETWEEN
Timothy and Thomas, &c.

Tho. **G**ood morrow, Mr. *Timothy*!

Tim. Who's that, my Friend *Thomas*? What do you do here at this time of Day? I hope you don't play Truant.

Tho. That's well enough guess'd in the Holidays. At least you might have thought it was the Liberty of the *Hebrew* Form I took, where we do what we've a Mind to. But if you must know, I have taken my Leave of School some time.

Tim. How so?

Tho. If you had ask'd me why I staid there so long, I should have been more at a Loss to have answer'd you. Do Authors use to go to School?

Tim. What do you mean by that?

Tho. That I'm an Author.

Tim. Of what?

Tho. More Books than one. I have had a hand in several, but two are mine more particularly.

Tim. They have Names, I presume, both of them.

Tho. Yes, and my Name to them into the Bargain.

Tim. I have seen indeed a Pamphlet about Purgatory, and a Letter, with your Name. You don't mean them?

Tho. But I do. Pray where's the Improbability?

Tim. Nay, I shan't envy you either of them. But they carry that Air of Authority, I concluded the Author must be at least some very Reverend Dignitary of the Church: and yet at the same time are so exceedingly trifling, that I made a Scruple of guessing they came from any Friend of mine.

Tho. I find you have seen the Title Page, and that's all.

Tim. All that's to be seen. But you'll learn a little better Logick, 'tis to be hop'd, if not better Manners, where you are going.

Tho. Where's that? I don't understand you.

Tim. I mean at the University.

Tho. Thank ye for that; I'm not going thither. A Friend of mine had like to have been led astray by going thither not long since. Besides I have no need of it; I got Logick enough from a Friend by the by, to know the Vanity of it. I can say, I have been at *Oxford*, and that's enough. In short, Logick is a *Pagan* Invention, and unfit to be imploy'd in a Controversy between Christians. Besides there is really no need of it. A Friend of mine, a great Man, never uses any. He has introduc'd a new Way, and dispatch'd three or four Books, without a Word of it, from one End to t'other.

Tim. That's extraordinary indeed, and much good may it do you. But my Curiosity does not lie that way. The old fashion'd Method will serve me. But pray what's the Meaning of *Priest*, and *Priest of the Catholic Church*, at full Length in Capitals, in the Books you say are yours?

Tho. The same that uses to be. Because I have been in Orders these two or three Years.

Tim. That's impossible. Why thou art hardly of Age yet, Man. There's a Canon or two in the way.

Tho.

Tho. No matter for that. I have a Friend dispens'd with that for asking. He'll do as much for you, or any one else, if you have a Mind to't, to morrow Morning, provided only that you will be on the right Side, in our present Controversy. Pray were not Archbishop *Usher*, and Bishop *Taylor* in Orders before the Age requir'd by the Canon? And I would know why a Canon may not as well be dispens'd with now upon a like extraordinary Occasion, wherever there is the same unusual Ripeness of Understanding and Discretion.

Tim. I find you are the same modest Man out of Print, as in it; and blush just as much as your Books do.

Tho. Make as merry as you please! Truth and Innocence have no Reason to be out of Countenance.

Tim. I can't tell; if your Opinion in the Front of your Letter be right, that there are a sort of *Innocent Persons* who may be *justly accus'd*. I hope you keep no Correspondence with any such. What follows soon after is however indisputable, that ^a *supposed Guilt* may sometimes be of *ill Consequence to the Party accus'd*: and I think exactly agreeable to a Rule of yours ^b, that in a Controversy of a Religious Nature *every thing should be omitted that is not to the Purpose*.

Tho. I see you have nothing to object against my Arguments, by your playing the Fool with Words.

Tim. All in good time, dear *Tommy*. But first it will be convenient to clear your self a little better from the Charge of preferring Tradition before Scripture.

Tho. I have done it unanswerably.

Tim. That we must see by and by. In the mean time 'tis notorious, there's not a Syllable about Scripture in either of the two Instances alledged against you. Now, say you, in appealing to Tradition only, there is no Disrespect in the least shewn to Scripture, because *Scripture is included in Catholic Tradition*. That is to say, Scripture is a Part of Catholic Tradition, and consequently included in the whole. And indeed you

^a Letter, p. 1.

^b Purgatory, p. 11.

^c Letter, p. 8.
and

and your Friends make it the least considerable Part too; since Tradition is all along urg'd as a ^d sufficient Authority to found a necessary Duty upon: and Scripture is only so when interpreted by Tradition.

But you go on. And for Argument's sake suppose, that ^e Scripture was not imply'd in the Words produc'd against you. In that Case, you prove your Respect to Scripture, and that you do not set it aside, by producing a Quotation of a ^f Text of Scripture in the Title-Page of your Letter. If this be proving your point, I'll engage by the same Logick to prove St. *Paul* was no Christian, from his quoting one of the Heathen Poets to the *Athenians*, Acts 17. 28. But to shew you this is not a Demonstration, I will only put you in mind, that a Text of Scripture was once quoted to our *Saviour* in the Desert, by one that you will not be positive had a particular Regard for Scripture, or preferr'd it much before Tradition. The Text you cite, *Prove all things, hold fast that which is good*, you have the Charity, we thank you, to ^g wish us the Consideration and Practice of. In return, pray consider if some People have not inverted it, by first *holding fast*, before they have prov'd whether the things *be good*.

The second Argument in your Favour, pag. 3^d, is fetch'd from your Preface. There you affirm, say you that a *Writer of Controversies of a Religious Nature should produce his Arguments from Scripture, Tradition or Reason*. Than which nothing can more plainly shew, you think it indifferent from which of them.

Your third Argument, (pag. 4.) in which you let know the Skill you have in Chronology, is that *Scripture recommends Tradition*. Had I said that *Julius Cæsar* in his Commentaries very much recommends *Machiavel's Art of War*, or that Tradition recommends your Book of Purgatory; I can guess what Title some People would have given me. However this was well intended.

^d Letter, p. 3.

^e Letter, p. 3.

^f Letter, *ibid.*

^g *ibid.*

A Fourth Proof you bring from Page 4. of your Purgatory, namely, that you take **Scripture and Tradition** for a Rule of Faith; and profess to believe nothing but what Jesus Christ taught his Apostles, who have transmitted to us by **Scripture and Tradition** the whole Sum of our Belief. It is plain here, that Scripture alone does not in your Opinion contain the whole of our Belief; so that if you believe only what Jesus Christ taught his Apostles, as you profess, you cannot believe all you ought to do. But what I must insist upon is, that you shew us where our Saviour taught his Apostles the Necessity of the Mixture, of Prayers for the Dead, &c. or where the Apostles taught either of them. As for that Tradition of the Apostles you talk of, which they have transmitted to us; besides Scripture, I own I never had the good Luck to see it. If you have such a Manuscript by you, 'tis a Curiosity indeed; and you certainly wrong the Christian World very much by talking of it only.

Your Fifth Argument, in the same Page, you will have to be alone a full Vindication. I can see nothing in it, nor in the following, but a farther Demonstration of your placing Tradition upon the Level with Scripture, by your appealing still to both, but never to Scripture alone. So that Scripture is no farther of Authority than as Tradition shall allow; which is as much as any *Papist* will desire of you.

^h But your seventh and last Argument is a Master-piece. In *that very Page*, it seems, from whence one of the exceptionable Passages is taken, you expressly mention **Scripture, as well as Tradition**. A Favour indeed! Had it been in the next Page, the Argument had not been worth a Farthing.

I own, I think you have brought Arguments enough for any reasonable Man. If not, I will help you to another from your Dialogue with the *Pedilavian*, pag. 8. that *Scripture and Tradition are no more than*

^h Letter, pag. 4.

different Ways of Publishing the Will of God, and only two streams flowing from the same Fountain.

Upon the whole then, the utmost you can make of your Reasoning is this; That you do not wholly set aside Scripture, because you do *sometimes* mention such a thing; and that you do not postpone it to Tradition, because you have sometimes placed them upon the level.

As to your Questions, page 3. *Don't we receive the Bible by Tradition? Can we be assur'd of its Divine Authority but by Tradition? Can we distinguish between Canonical and Apocryphal Books, between genuine and spurious Writings of the Apostles but by Tradition?* If this be proving an Authority in Tradition, I'll prove the same of the profane Greek Authors. For do we not receive the New Testament in Greek? Can we know its Signification without a competent Skill in their Writings? Can we distinguish in any difficult places without the Help of their Writings? So that we might as well have spared the New Testament as *Theocritus*; for, as youⁱ say, the former would have been of no Authority without the latter.

But after all, I am amaz'd at your Confidence, that you should complain of it as a false Accusation, that you disrespect Scripture, when you are labouring to shew that you do. Pray let me ask you, Is not that which gives Authority to another, of greater Authority than that which receives Authority from it? And do you not declare the Scripture to have its Authority from Tradition; not the Books only of the Scripture (which by the by is little concern'd in your Controversy, because the Scripture throughout the Church is taken *pro confesso*, to be the Word of God) but the very Doctrines contain'd in those Books, must have their Warrant from Tradition too; and then it is plain Tradition, which stamps the Doctrine with Authority, must be of greater Authority. And thus you clear your self of the Accusation, by proving it true.

ⁱ *Purg. pag. 15, 16.*

Tho. I assert Scripture to be a part of Catholick Tradition.

Tim. You do so, and at the same time make it insignificant without Tradition. Pray where does the Scripture deliver the Mixture to be necessary, or that departed Souls want Light or Refreshment? And that it is a necessary Duty to mix, and pray?

Tho. In Answer to your Question, pray answer mine. Have we not proved that the Catholick Church always practis'd both?

Tim. No indeed, you have not proved it. There is the first Century and half at least, out of your Proof, and that is the most necessary part of the Tradition that should make good your Pretence. Nor has that Tradition which you appeal'd to, declar'd these Points to be necessary parts of Christianity. But if it had, How came the Church by those Doctrines, if our Saviour and Apostles delivered no such Doctrines? If the Church delivers what it did not receive, it is not true to its Trust; and therefore you must have a care of making it deliver for Doctrines, what it only practis'd as convenient, as things then were. No Authority merely Human can warrant a Point of Faith; and Tradition without Scripture is merely Human Authority.

Tho. But would the Church have practis'd what it did not think necessary, as we prove the Church practis'd our Points?

Tim. That's a Question I need not answer: and yet it is easily done. Did not the Church communicate Infants, and yet afterwards laid that Practice aside?

Tho. It is true, it did. But in answer to this troublesome Objection, My great Friend has told his Adversary, that he and his Party may communicate Infants still, if they please.

Tim. This is notable indeed! But then what becomes of your negative kind of Tradition? Or does that prove it necessary, as you affirm Catholick Tradition makes our Points, which stand on the same level?

Tho. No, they do not; for communicating Infants has not been continu'd down.

Tim. But was it not universally practised for several Centuries?

Tho. Yes, it was, but not continu'd down to the Reformation.

Tim. But, pray, Mr. *Thomas*, resolve me; if the universal Practice of the Church can make it necessary (as all the proof of your Point supposes) and communicating Infants continu'd for four or five Centuries: How came the Church of the sixth or seventh Century to presume to lay it aside? Was not the Practice of the Catholick Church as authoritative in one Age as in another? I know your great Friend will not allow the latter Ages so much Authority as the first. You know he calls some of them an *illuminated Age*.

Tho. He does so; and is not that a great matter?

Tim. A long Word it is; but with very little meaning in it. If you mean by *Illumination*, Inspiration, you put the Writers of those Ages upon the level with the Apostles, which perhaps you won't care to say: If you do not mean by it Inspiration, you leave them upon the Level with us, as to any thing of Authority; for there can be no Medium, either they were inspir'd, or they were not. And I cannot help concluding this Term was made use of with a Design opposite to its Signification: not to enlighten, but to cast a Mist over our Understandings, by a Distinction that seems to be something, but has really nothing in it.

Tho. When you have done, I must tell you, that after all your little Quibbles, I have still the same Sentiments of my Vindication.

Tim. That I'll not dispute with you. But to use your own ^k Words, give me leave to ask you seriously, of what Service to you are these Passages, now they are taken notice of? Never henceforward complain of being ^l dress'd frightfully, when the garments are every one of them your own. I cannot leave this particular

[II]

without making my Complaint too (*Letter*, pag. 4.) in my turn; Hard is it that such Men, (such Boys rather) should be admitted Priests of the Catholick Church, as give Occasion to the World to call upon them to declare that they believe and respect the Scriptures. Yet this is our Case.

Tho. Have you read Dr. *Brett's* Book of Tradition. 'Tis an unanswerable one.

Tim. I think not; among other Reasons, because you are not sure but he may one Day answer it himself, as well as he has done some other of his Performances. In the mean time you may see what Archbishop *Laud* has said upon the Subject to *Fisher*, in the 16th Section.

Tho. You thought to have reflected upon the Doctor, and have given him the highest Encomium. What can be more fair and honourable, than to retract where a Man finds himself to have been in the wrong, and misguided others too?

Tim. Very right. And I wish the Doctor's Example may have its just weight with you, among the rest.

Tho. Sure 'tis time to have done with this.

Tim. Not whilst you are^m demanding publicly a Retraction of that charge, which you are at the very time proving against your self. But then there's the Dialogue.

Tho. You had better have pass'd that by. You'll not easily get clear of that, or I'm mistaken.

Tim. I see nothing formidable but the Length of it, which is two thirds of the whole Epistle. But a Dialogue in a Letter was a thing intirely new, and there could not be too much on't.

Tho. I hope you have your Belly full of Scripture there. I'm sure there's some you won't digest in haste.

Tim. You meant that you won't. Indeed your Quotations from your Adversary are admirably chosen, and a full Answer to more than you will ever be able to say for your beloved Tradition.

Tho. You mistake it, it shews the Necessity of Tradition, and that your self are forc'd after all to have re-

course to it, to vindicate your own Practice, which cannot otherwise be done.

Tim. In a word, if I understand you, the whole is no more than this; You think you have found out a positive Precept in Scripture, That of *washing one another's Feet*, which we neglect; and that we have no way to justify our Conduct in the Case, but by recourse to Tradition, which has interpreted this express Precept not to be binding. This now you would have to be (*pag. 6, 14.*) *leaving Scripture, and setting up Tradition as rather to be attended to.*

Now supposing it a positive Precept, I would fain know how Tradition (let it be Catholick as it will) can justify our overlooking it? Or how any Man dares ascribe that Authority to Tradition? But suppose, again, that Tradition could do this; shew me a Tradition for it. 'Twill not suffice you to say, a general Disuse is in this Case equivalent to a Tradition; for at that rate the ten Commandments may come in time to be unnecessary; and besides, 'tis setting up *no Tradition*, which is nothing, upon the same Foot with Scripture, or according to you, with *Scripture, Tradition, or Reason*. But are there no such things as Parables, and Allegories in Scripture? Will not common Sense, and the Reason of the thing tell us, that there are many Precepts which were never design'd to be understood in the literal Sense? And I must take leave to ask you, If you do not in your Conscience believe, that the meanest Capacity would distinguish this of *washing one another's Feet*, to be one of that sort; design'd only to set us a Pattern of Charity and Humility. If you deny this, I shall insist upon your *hating Father and Mother*, and *being perfect, as God himself is perfect*, and many other such Duties, which are as express as this can be.

Tho. At this rate you may interpret away all the Commands in the Gospel.

Tim. There seems more danger of your setting up a

new one by Tradition. Pray, how long have you been acquainted with Fathers and Councils?

Tho. Long enough you see to be Master of most of 'em. But, which is more than every Body knows, my Benefactor in Logick gave me a list that way too, particularly with an Eye to Church-Government and Controversy.

Tim. Then I dare answer for him, he is sorry for it before now.

Tho. That's not to the purpose. Can you answer my Challenge, (*Letter*, pag. 15.) to shew an Instance of one Catholick Bishop or Priest, who ever consecrated or receiv'd the sacramental Cup without Water in it.

Tim. No really, Friend *Thomas*, 'tis beyond my Skill. I am not yet well enough acquainted either with the Fathers, or Logick, to prove such a Negative. I must come to you for that. Pray shew me an Instance where the *Jews* ever solemniz'd the Passover without Scarlet, Wool and Hyssop? Tho' now I think on't, it may be done in your way of proving. This is prov'd in such a Page; that is demonstrated in such a one; that has already been made appear in such a Place; when there is not a tittle of Truth in e'er a one of 'em. You have indeed a great Man for your Precedent in this (as well as your Assistant) who in some late Writings of his upon the same Subject, has by this means sav'd himself the trouble of ever going beyond a Probability, or Proving any thing, but that he is at present out of his Element, where Fancy and Flourish won't do his Business. 'Tis true, while he had Strollers, Buffoons, Libertines, Deists, and such Wretches, the Reproach of Mankind, to deal with; no Treatment could be too bad for 'em. They who had broken thro' all Decency themselves, who made a Jest of Religion and Morality, and defy'd and challeng'd their Maker; deserv'd not to be treated with Arguments, and could only be ill-us'd by Mildness and Civility. His Fancy, his Figures had there a proper subject, and he perform'd to excellent Purpose. But to see Men of Integrity and Reputation with any degree of

of the same Treatment, to triumph, and insult over them with an *it seems*, in an Affair of the utmost Concern, instead of giving Proofs; is what as little becomes a Gentleman of the Character he once bore, to give himself the Liberty of, as it does you to imitate. With Submission to this Gentleman, strip but his late Performances of Harangue and Fancy, and you will leave little for the Reader. His former Reputation procures him a Hearing, and then he flourishes you out of your Understanding. But 'tis no new thing to observe the ill Influence of a great Man in Errors.

Tho. Let me tell you, the Great Man you mean, is not a fit Subject for your Raillery, nor a safe one.

Tim. But his Mistakes and Fallacies are fit to be detected by me, or any Man, especially when he imposes 'em upon Mankind, and under penalty of Damnation too. I have a great Respect for that Gentleman, upon more Accounts than one; but when he talks of *Drawing the Curtains of the Grave, and opening a Communication with the other World*, I must desire to be excus'd.

Tho. I see what you would be at. You fancy you have something to say against Prayers for the Dead.

Tim. Against the Necessity of them I have. But particularly against your way of proving them necessary.

Tho. You'll grant 'em lawful?

Tim. If I do, I'll not grant their Necessity is any Consequence of it. 'Tis your Business to prove particularly of what Benefit they are, who have affirm'd, that if they are *not of Use*, they are directly *superstitious*. But if your Logic be good, if their being barely lawful proves them necessary; I expect you should shew more the Unlawfulness of praying for *departed wicked Men* or else extend your Charity to them too. In the meantime you would do well to give us a Rule, by which we may distinguish who are departed in God Almighty Favour, and who not; otherwise our Prayers may happen to prove superstitious in your Notion of Superstition. But how came you so intimately acquainted with the good people of the other World, to pronounce the

perem

peremptorily upon the particulars of their Condition? Have you had a peep with the Great Man your Friend, and saw them toiling and sweating in the Dark, and desiring your Assistance? Want of ^o *Light, Ease and Refreshment*, suppose something for all the World like Purgatory: 'Tho perhaps you have not yet thought fit to heat it quite so hot as the *Papists* have done theirs. But all in good time. The *Papists*, to do them Justice, acknowledge this in Favour of their Purgatory, that they have had Messages more than once from thence, and the thanks too of the Souls reliev'd by their Prayers for them.

If you have as much to say, never fear, but speak out.

Tho. You'll not dispute, that they pray for us?

Tim. 'Tis what you cannot produce Scripture for: But we'll suppose it. What then?

Tho. Then which way in Gratitude can you excuse your not returning the good Office? ^p Now Gratitude I take to be a Branch of Justice.

Tim. As I said once before, shew me that they stand in need of, or can be any ways benefitted by our Prayers, and that from the only Authority that can inform us, which is the Scripture, and I give into you this Minute.

Tho. So then the Reason of the thing, and that supported by Catholick Tradition, will not satisfy you?

Tim. Not to found a necessary Duty upon, of which there is not so much as a Hint in Scripture. That would be just as if we should take up with an uncertain Report, when we have an authentick Record for our purpose. But since you insist so mightily upon the Reason of the thing, and a ^q Reciprocation of good Offices; may I now ask how come your Friends and you to overlook a whole Order of benevolent Beings, who we have the repeated Testimony of Scripture are continually ministering to our Good? I need not tell you, I mean the Holy Angels.

Tho. You say nothing to the Argument I retort upon you (*pag. 15.*) about the Mixture; that, allowing that Expression, *the Fruit of the Vine*, is to be taken in your

^o *Vid. New Liturgy.*

^p *Purg. p. 9.*

^q *Purgat. p. 9.*

own Sense ; still there is no Disproof of our Saviour's using Water, when he instituted the Eucharistic Cup.

Tim. I am asham'd to think, that any Man, who calls himself Priest of the Catholick Church, should offer such an Argument for the Necessity of any Practice, That we are not absolutely certain but it may be lawful. You might as well have prov'd the Essentiality of your Mixture from the Story of *David* and *Goliath*, for that will never disprove it, be satisfy'd. And here a Man would expect Mr. *Drake* might have been thought of ; but there may be Reasons to wave that, and we are in Civility to suppose you never heard of his Sermon. 'Twas necessary some Vessels of War should be fitted out, and that which could soonest be got ready, set sail first.

Tho. Still you forget to consider seriously, *how terrible the Consequence may be of omitting Part of our Redeemer's Cup*, (Letter, pag. 16.)

Tim. That's your Mistake. But I have consider'd too what the Consequence may be of *adding to it*; and I wish you may. A Divine at your Years has many things to consider.

Tho. Pray look me in the Face, and see what you can find there unbecoming that Character.

Tim. Don't ask me. I see two things very ill coupled, Boy and Confidence.

Tho. Were you to see me with my *Cope* on, perhaps you might think otherwise. However, there are those that do. But 'tis no matter. Let me see, I shall be past my Hour.

Tim. Are you so busy ?

Tho. I have a Translation upon the Anvil, which—but it won't be altogether to your Relish.

Tim. If you translate as unfairly as some Passages have been translated for the Benefit of the Controversy, you will not merit much at the Hands of Truth by your Performance.

Tho. I know what I have to do. Good by to you.

Tim. Yours.



our's
Cup
calls
offer
tice,
wful
your
that
Man
t of
n Ci
T was
, and

ter-
Re-

d too
with
ngs to

you
cou-

perhaps
those
all be

ich—

s have
, you
r Per-

ou.



